



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/551,620

11/28/2006

Nicholas William Anderson

9010/96000 (04-0102)

5901

22242 7590 03/30/2010  
FITCH EVEN TABIN & FLANNERY  
120 SOUTH LASALLE STREET  
SUITE 1600  
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

DANIEL JR, WILLIE J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/30/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/551,620	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ANDERSON, NICHOLAS WILLIAM	
	<b>Examiner</b> WILLIE J. DANIEL JR	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/28/2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 November 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2617

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to application filed on 28 November 2006 (including amendment).

**Claims 1-32** are now pending in the present application. This office action is made **Non-Final**.

#### ***Priority***

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in **United Kingdom** on **13 August 2004**. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the **GB 0418107.9** application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on

- a. 02 April 2008

- b. 03 February 2006

is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 and is being considered by the examiner.

The IDS (see item 3a above) included reference document(s) that was/were lined through (or crossed-out) and have not been considered by the Examiner. Reasons for not considering the documents are at the least the following:

- i. The IDS included cite no. 7 that indicated a *written opinion* was filed but the written opinion is not included in the document. The Examiner recommends that applicant reviews the submitted reference document(s) to verify if all papers were are provided.

***Drawings***

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description:
  - a. Fig. 1 ‘ref. 105’.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive.

***Specification***

6. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because
  - a. The abstract recites the language “...Fig. 1 to accompany...” in line(s) 29 of the abstract. The Examiner suggests removing said language to help clarify the abstract. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Art Unit: 2617

7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- a. The specification recites the limitation "...reduced..." on page(s) 8 of the specification. The Examiner requests that the punctuation **mark** -- . -- be added and suggests replacing the limitation with -- reduced. -- to help clarify the claim language.

Appropriate correction is required.

8. This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive.

### ***Claim Objections***

9. **Claim 25** is objected to because of the following informalities:

- a. Claim 25 recite the limitation "...station..." in line(s) 2 of the claim. The Examiner requests that the punctuation **mark** -- . -- be added and suggests replacing the limitation with -- station. -- to help clarify the claim language..

Appropriate correction is required.

10. This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-5, 7-13, 16-25, 27-29, and 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cao et al.** (hereinafter Cao) (**US 6,647,005 B1**) in view of **Terry et al.** (hereinafter Terry) (**US 6,587,697 B2**).

Regarding **claims 1 and 29**, Cao discloses an apparatus for transmitting user equipment specific information from a base station (e.g., BS) to a user equipment (e.g., mobile station MS) in a cellular communication system (see col. 3, lines 8-17; Fig. 10);

the apparatus comprising:

means for combining user equipment specific information for a plurality of user equipment to generate combined user equipment specific information (see col. 4, lines 30-35,40-42; Fig. 10), where the system multiplexes information for multiple users;

means for encoding the combined user equipment specific information (see col. 2, line 66 - col. 3, line 2; col. 4, lines 3-5); and

means for transmitting the combined user equipment specific information in a minimum transmission resource unit (e.g., slot) (see col. 3, line 20; col. 4, lines 38-42; Fig. 10). Cao inexplicitly discloses having the feature(s) encoding. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) encoding was well known in the art, as taught by Terry.

In the same field of endeavor, Terry discloses the feature(s) encoding (see col. 4, lines 1-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cao and Terry to have the feature(s) encoding, in order a method of performing power control while minimizing the overhead, as taught by Terry (see col. 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding **claim 2**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the minimum transmission resource unit is a time slot (see col. 3, line 20; col. 4, lines 38-42; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 3**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the minimum transmission resource unit is a single time code frequency resource allocation unit (see col. 4, lines 38-42; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 4**, Cao discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the means for encoding is operable to jointly encode user equipment specific information for at least two of the plurality of user equipment (see col. 4, lines 3-5, 38-42, 49-51, 60-62; Fig. 10). Cao inexplicitly discloses having the feature(s) encoding. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) encoding was well known in the art, as taught by Terry.

Terry further discloses the feature(s) encoding (see col. 4, lines 1-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cao and Terry to have the feature(s)

Art Unit: 2617

encoding, in order a method of performing power control while minimizing the overhead, as taught by Terry (see col. 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding **claim 5**, Cao discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the means for encoding is operable to jointly encode user equipment specific information associated with all user equipment of the plurality of user equipment (see col. 4, lines 3-5,38-42,49-51,60-62; Fig. 10). Cao inexplicitly discloses having the feature(s) encoding. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) encoding was well known in the art, as taught by Terry.

Terry further discloses the feature(s) encoding (see col. 4, lines 1-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cao and Terry to have the feature(s) encoding, in order a method of performing power control while minimizing the overhead, as taught by Terry (see col. 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding **claims 7 and 32**, Cao discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 4 wherein the user equipment specific information comprises a plurality of parameters each having a number of possible values, and wherein the means for encoding is operable to encode the plurality of parameters by encoding a combined parameter having a combined number of possible values equal to the product of the number of possible values of the plurality of parameters (see col. 4, lines 3-5,38-42,49-51,60-62; Fig. 10). Cao inexplicitly discloses having the feature(s) encoding. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) encoding was well known in the art, as taught by Terry.

Terry further discloses the feature(s) encoding (see col. 4, lines 1-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cao and Terry to have the feature(s) encoding, in order a method of performing power control while minimizing the overhead, as taught by Terry (see col. 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding **claim 8**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the user equipment specific information comprises power control information (see col. 3, lines 25-30).

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the user equipment specific information comprises synchronisation information (see col. 3, lines 25-30; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 10**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the user equipment specific information comprises only synchronisation information (see col. 3, lines 25-30; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 11**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the user equipment specific information is associated with an uplink channel from each of the plurality of user equipment (see col. 4, lines 13-15; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 12**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as

Art Unit: 2617

claimed in claim 1 further comprising means for setting a transmit power for the minimum transmission resource unit in response to a transmit power requirement of the plurality of user equipment (see col. 4, lines 13-15; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 13**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 further comprising means for transmitting position information indicative of a position of user equipment specific information for a first user equipment (see col. 4, lines 13-15,60-62; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 16**, Cao discloses an apparatus as claimed claim 1 wherein the means for encoding is operable to encode the combined user equipment specific information by using processing algorithms of a group of algorithms used by a plurality of services (see col. 4, lines 3-5,38-42,49-51,60-62; Fig. 10). Cao inexplicitly discloses having the feature(s) encoding. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) encoding was well known in the art, as taught by Terry.

Terry further discloses the feature(s) encoding (see col. 4, lines 1-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cao and Terry to have the feature(s) encoding, in order a method of performing power control while minimizing the overhead, as taught by Terry (see col. 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding **claim 17**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 further comprising means for transmitting position information indicative

Art Unit: 2617

of a position of user equipment specific information for a first user equipment (see col. 4, lines 13-15,60-62; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 18**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 16), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 16 wherein the cellular communication system is the UTRA (UMTS (Universal Mobile Telecommunication System) Terrestrial Radio Access) TDD cellular communication system specified by the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (see col. 3, lines 8-17; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 19**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 18), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 18 wherein the user equipment specific information consists of Transmit Power Control (TPC) and Synchronisation Shift (SS) data (see col. 3, lines 25-30; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 20**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 further comprising means for determining a transmit power of the minimum transmission resource unit in response to a number of user equipment for which the minimum transmission resource unit comprises user equipment specific information (see col. 3, lines 25-30; col. 4, lines 13-15,60-62; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 21**, Cao discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 further comprising means for determining an encoding process for the minimum transmission resource unit in response to a number of user equipment for which the minimum transmission resource unit comprises user equipment specific information (see col. 4, lines 3-5,38-42,49-

Art Unit: 2617

51,60-62; Fig. 10). Cao inexplicitly discloses having the feature(s) encoding. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) encoding was well known in the art, as taught by Terry.

Terry further discloses the feature(s) encoding (see col. 4, lines 1-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cao and Terry to have the feature(s) encoding, in order a method of performing power control while minimizing the overhead, as taught by Terry (see col. 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding **claim 22**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 21), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 21 wherein the minimum transmission resource unit does not comprise verification data (see col. 4, lines 38-42,49-51,60-62; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 23**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the means for transmitting is operable to transmit user equipment specific information for a first user in intermittent minimum transmission resource units (see col. 4, lines 38-42,49-51,60-62; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 24**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the minimum transmission resource unit corresponds to a minimum size transmission block of user equipment specific information which can be transmitted by the means for transmitting (see col. 4, lines 38-42,49-51,60-62; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 25**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Cao further discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the apparatus is a base station (see col. 4, lines 13-19; Fig. 10).

Regarding **claim 27**, Cao discloses a user equipment as claimed in claim 26 wherein the combined user equipment specific information is jointly encoded; and wherein the means for determining comprises means for decoding the combined user equipment specific information and for selecting the user equipment specific information for the user equipment (see col. 2, line 66 - col. 3, line 2; col. 4, lines 3-5), where decoding would be implicit to receive information as evidenced by the fact that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize. Cao inexplicitly discloses having the feature(s) encoding. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) encoding was well known in the art, as taught by Terry.

Terry further discloses the feature(s) encoding (see col. 4, lines 1-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cao and Terry to have the feature(s) encoding, in order a method of performing power control while minimizing the overhead, as taught by Terry (see col. 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding **claim 28**, Cao discloses a cellular communication system (see col. 3, lines 8-17; Fig. 10) comprising

a first apparatus for transmitting user equipment specific information from a base station (e.g., BS) to a user equipment (e.g., mobile station MS) (see col. 4, lines 13-15), the first apparatus comprising:

Art Unit: 2617

means for combining user equipment specific information for a plurality of user equipment to generate combined user equipment specific information (see col. 4, lines 30-35,40-42; Fig. 10), where the system multiplexes information for multiple users,

means for encoding the combined user equipment specific information (see col. 2, line 66 - col. 3, line 2; col. 4, lines 3-5), and

means for transmitting the combined user equipment specific information in a minimum transmission resource unit (e.g., slot) (see col. 3, line 20; col. 4, lines 38-42; Fig. 10); and

the user equipment (see col. 4, lines 13-15) comprising:

means for receiving a minimum transmission resource unit comprising combined user equipment specific information for a plurality of user equipment (see col. 4, lines 30-35,40-42; Fig. 10), where the system multiplexes information for multiple users; and

means for determining user specific information for the user equipment from the minimum transmission resource unit (e.g., slot) (see col. 3, line 20; col. 4, lines 38-42; Fig. 10). Cao inexplicitly discloses having the feature(s) encoding. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) encoding was well known in the art, as taught by Terry.

Terry further discloses the feature(s) encoding (see col. 4, lines 1-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cao and Terry to have the feature(s) encoding, in order a method of performing power control while minimizing the overhead, as taught by Terry (see col. 2, lines 40-42).

Art Unit: 2617

**Claims 6 and 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cao et al.** (hereinafter Cao) (US **6,647,005 B1**) in view of **Terry et al.** (hereinafter Terry) (US **6,587,697 B2**) as applied to claim 4 and 5 above, and further in view of **Tsunechara et al.** (hereinafter Tsunechara) (US **7,006,463 B2**).

Regarding **claims 6 and 31**, the combination of Cao and Terry discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claim 4. Cao does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) wherein the encoding comprises forward error correcting coding. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) wherein the encoding comprises forward error correcting coding was well known in the art, as taught by Tsunechara.

In the same field of endeavor, Tsunechara discloses the feature(s) wherein the encoding comprises forward error correcting coding (see col. 5, lines 10-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cao, Terry, and Tsunechara to have the feature(s) wherein the encoding comprises forward error correcting coding, in order to provide a system in which a base station controls transmission power, as taught by Tsunechara (see col. 2, lines 53-57).

**Claim 14-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cao et al.** (hereinafter Cao) (US **6,647,005 B1**) in view of **Terry et al.** (hereinafter Terry) (US **6,587,697 B2**) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Kim et al.** (hereinafter Kim) (US **7,450,611 B2**).

Regarding **claim 14**, Cao discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the user equipment specific information is control information associated with service (see col. 4,

Art Unit: 2617

lines 13-15,60-62; col. 3, lines 25-30; Fig. 10). The combination of Cao and Terry does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) High Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA) service. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) High Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA) service was well known in the art, as taught by Kim.

In the same field of endeavor, Kim discloses the feature(s) High Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA) service (see col. 9, lines 55-60; col. 12, lines 19-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cao, Terry, and Kim to have the feature(s) High Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA) service, in order to provide an apparatus and method for transmitting and receiving information for user in an HSDPA communication system, as taught by Tsunehara (see col. 7, lines 34-39).

Regarding **claim 15**, Cao discloses an apparatus as claimed in claim 14 wherein the user equipment specific information is associated with an uplink dedicated physical channel (DPCH) of the HSDPA downlink packet data service (see col. 4, lines 13-15,60-62; col. 3, lines 25-30; Fig. 10). The combination of Cao and Terry does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) High Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA) service. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) High Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA) service was well known in the art, as taught by Kim.

In the same field of endeavor, Kim discloses the feature(s) High Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA) service (see col. 9, lines 55-60; col. 12, lines 19-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cao, Terry, and Kim to have the

Art Unit: 2617

feature(s) High Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA) service, in order to provide an apparatus and method for transmitting and receiving information for user in an HSDPA communication system, as taught by Tsunehara (see col. 7, lines 34-39).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 26 and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Cao et al.** (hereinafter Cao) (US 6,647,005 B1).

Regarding **claims 26 and 30**, Cao discloses a user equipment (e.g., mobile station MS) for receiving user equipment specific information from a base station (e.g., BS) in a cellular communication system (see col. 3, lines 8-17; Fig. 10);

the apparatus comprising:

means for receiving a minimum transmission resource unit comprising combined user equipment specific information for a plurality of user equipment (see col. 4, lines 30-35, 40-42; Fig. 10), where the system multiplexes information for multiple users; and

means for determining user specific information for the user equipment from the minimum transmission resource unit (e.g., slot) (see col. 3, line 20; col. 4, lines 38-42; Fig. 10).

*Conclusion*

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIE J. DANIEL JR whose telephone number is (571)272-7907. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/WJD,Jr/

WJD,Jr  
26 March 2010

/Charles N. Appiah/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617